

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims set forth in the Official Action of March 20, 2006 is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-18 are currently pending.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 4, 7, 8, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 5, 10, 11, 15 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Applicants' Response**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5, 10, 11, 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,850,496 to Knappe et al. ("Knappe"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 of the present invention recites, *inter alia*, "a session initiation protocol (SIP) signaling interface." As disclosed, e.g. in paragraphs [0003] and [0004] of the specification, SIP is one of the two major protocols used in Internet telephony and is gaining in popularity as a standard signaling protocol for use in Internet telephony.

No such arrangement is disclosed in or suggested by Knappe. Instead, Knappe is directed to a virtual conference room for voice conferencing and, in particular, systems and

methods for use with packet voice conferencing to create a perception of spatial separation between conference callers. Knappe fails to disclose or suggest use of a SIP signaling interface as required by claim 1.

In making the rejection, the Examiner cites col. 6, lines 20-25 and lines 63-65 of Knappe, which discusses a network interface that “provides connectivity between a packet-switched network and the remainder of system” and a controller that “sends and receives control packets to/from remote endpoints using network interface.” However, Knappe’s interface is not directed to a SIP signaling interface and therefore Knappe does not disclose this element and can not properly anticipate or render obvious claim 1.

Additionally, claim 1 of the present invention recites, *inter alia*, “a mixer, the mixer receiving the jitter corrected data from each of the queues, generating an aggregate conferencing stream of all active participants, and generating individual participant conference streams for each active participant in the conference.” Knappe does not disclose or suggest a single mixer which aggregates conferencing streams of all active participants. Instead, Knappe utilizes a separate set of mixers for each endpoint (column 12, lines 26-27 and shown in Figure 13A as 158L, 158R, 164L, 164R, 104L, and 104R). Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Knappe for at least this additional reason.

Claims 2, 3 and 6 depend from claim 1 and should be patentable over the cited art for at least those reasons recited above.

Claim 9 of the present invention recites, *inter alia*, “mixing each of the audio streams into an aggregate audio stream” and “for each active participant, subtracting that participant’s audio stream from the aggregate audio stream to generate a corresponding participant conference

stream.” Knappe fails to disclose or suggest mixing all the participants’ streams into an aggregate stream and then subtracting out each active participant’s stream to from their own stream. Instead, as explained in the portion of Knappe cited by the Examiner, (col. 14, lines 32-42) Knappe makes individual sets of mixed channels for each conferencing endpoint by adding the other participants streams. In Knappe there is no aggregate stream including **all** participants’ streams and no **subtraction** of streams as claimed Applicants’ claim 9. Therefore, Knappe does not anticipate or render obvious claim 9 of Applicants’ invention.

Independent claim 14, which is a software arrangement substantially corresponding to claim 9, is patentable over Knappe for the same reasons as discussed above for Claim 9. Claim 13 depends from claim 9 and should be patentable for at least those reasons recited above. Claim 18 depends from claim 14 and should be patentable for at least those reasons recited above.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 9, 13, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knappe. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 4 depends on claim 1, which is patentable over Knappe for the reasons discussed above. Claim 12 depends on claim 9, which is patentable over Knappe for the reasons discussed above. Claim 17 depends on claim 14, which is patentable over Knappe for the reasons discussed above. As such, claims 4, 12 and 17, which depend from claims 1, 9 and 14 respectively are not rendered obvious by Knappe. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knappe in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0025073 A1, to Kwan (“Kwan”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 7 and 8 depend on claim 1, which is patentable over Knappe for the reasons discussed above.

Kwan is directed to buffer allocation in voice conferencing systems. Therefore, Kwan does not cure the deficiencies of Knappe. As such, claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim 1, are not rendered obvious by Knappe or Kwan, either alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By:



Paul A. Ragusa  
Patent Office Reg. No. 38,587

30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10012-4498

*Attorney for Applicants*  
212-408-2500